

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vrignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.             | FILING DATE               | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 09/664,105                  | 09/19/2000                | Robert W. Mason      | LYON 0117 PUS           | 5382            |
| 22045 759                   | 90 07/22/2003             |                      |                         |                 |
| BROOKS & KUSHMAN            |                           |                      | EXAMINER                |                 |
| 1000 TOWN CE<br>SOUTHFIELD, | ENTER 22ND FL<br>MI 48075 |                      | OH, TAYLOR V            |                 |
|                             |                           |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER    |
|                             |                           |                      | 1625                    |                 |
|                             |                           |                      | DATE MAILED: 07/22/2003 | * 7             |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application N .  | Applicant(s)                           |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/664,105   | MASON, ROBERT W.                       |  |  |  |
| riariceity rieden   | Examin r   | Art Unit                               |  |  |  |
|   | Taylor Victor Oh   | 1625                                   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 7/30/2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) $\square$ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceli<br/>NOTE:</li></ul>  | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claims.                 |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | ion(s):  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see page 2.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t                                       | o issues which were newly              |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   | (s) a)∏ will not be entered or b)<br>ould be rejected is provided belo | ⊠ will be entered and an wor appended. |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>26-28, 31,33, 37, 42, 46, 48, 50, ar</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   | <u>nd 52</u> .   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   | ·                                      |  |  |  |
| 10. ☐ Other:  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 1625

21/8/3

It is noted that applicants have filed an Amendment after the Final Rejection; applicants' attorney has addressed the issues of record or rebutted the obviousness under 35 USC 103 (a). Due to the applicants' attorney convincing argument, the rejection of Claims 26-53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over over Okawa (U.S. 5,166,414) in view of Kober et al (U.S. 3,366,662) in view of Faraj (U.S. 5,686,645) has been withdrawn.

However, in order for the application to be allowable, applicants have to modify claims 26-28, 31, 33, 37, 42, 46, 48, 50, and 52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Unless the changes are made to the claims, the prosecution of allowing the application will be delayed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taylor Victor Oh whose telephone number is 703-305-0809. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on 703-308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-2742 for regular communications and 703-305-7401 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

ALAN L. ROTMAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

alan L. Rotman